DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 779 EA 014 271

AUTHOR Reed, Linda; And Others
TITLE Survey of State Procedures for the Validation of Educational Programs. Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Mo. R&D Interpretation Service.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 32p.; A collaborative effort of the Research and Development Exchange. For related documents, see EA 014 269-270 and EA 014 272.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Improvement; *Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal State Relationship; Information Dissemination; National Surveys; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Validation; *Quality Control; Regional Laboratories; Research and Development Centers; State Departments of Education; Tables (Data); *Validated Programs

ABSTRACT

Survey findings on state educational validation procedures show that of the 50 states surveyed, 45 have some form of established procedure for validation promising educational practices. Approximately two-thirds of the states that have validation programs employ either the Identification, Validation, Dissemination (IVD) procedure or some modification of it. Roughly a third of the states reported that they use their own state-developed validation processes. Forty-three states conduct site visits, following prescreening, to verify projects' status on the state's validation criteria. Significant variation occurs in the length of the site visits, the number of team members, and the composition of the teams. Twenty-seven states reported that they provide support to both the developer/demonstrators and the adopter/adapters of validated programs. Close to three-fourths of the states reportedly are involved in some form of cooperative activities with other nearby states. However, the cooperative activities center primarily on implementation of the validation procedure. Few if any states cooperate by actually sharing validated programs. A number of recommendations are made in the general areas of coordination and communication, funding, diffusion efforts, and the scope of the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) programs. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED209779

Survey of State Procedures for the Validation of Educational Programs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

August 1981

A Collaborative Effort of the
Research and Development Exchange

Prepared by

Linda Reed
R&D Interpretation Service
CEMREL, Inc.

Ed Patrick
Regional Exchange
Research for Better Schools, Inc.

David Holdzkom
Regional Exchange
Appalachia Educational Laboratory

EA 014 271

The material in this publication was prepared under a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

Research and Development Exchange (RDx)

Regional Exchanges (Rx)

Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL)
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325
(800) 624-9120

Director: Sandra Orletsky

CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63139
(314) 781-2900

Director: Carol Thomas

McREL
4709 Belleview
Kansas City, Missouri 64112
(816) 756-2401

Director: Susan Everson

Northeast Regional Exchange (NEREX)
Merrimack Education Center
101 Mill Road
Chelmsford, Massachusetts 01824
(617) 256-3985

Director: J. Lynn Griesemer

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL)
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 248-6800

Director: Joe Pascarelli

Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS)
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123
(215) 574-9300

Director: Richard McCann

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL)
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 476-6861

Director: Preston Kronkosky

SWRL Research and Development
4665 Lampson Avenue
Los Alamitos, California 90720
(213) 598-7661

Director: Roger Scott

Central Support Services

System Support Service
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 565-3179

Director: Stanley Chow

R&D Interpretation Service
CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63139
(314) 781-2900

Director: Linda Reed

Resource and Referral Service
National Center for Research in Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(614) 486-3655

Director: Jay Smink

Dissemination Support Service
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 248-6800

Director: Joe Pascarelli

Survey of State Procedures for the Validation of Educational Programs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This survey study was designed to identify: (1) the extent to which procedures to validate exemplary programs are being used by state departments of education in the fifty states; (2) the nature of the validation processes in use; (3) state implementation procedures for validation and the scope of state validation efforts to date; (4) state organizational arrangements for validation and the nature of state support for the dissemination of validated programs; and (5) the extent of state collaborative validation activities. The study also identified state concerns and recommendations pertinent to validation.

The study was conducted in 1980-1981 as a collaborative effort of the Regional Exchanges (Rxs) and the Research and Development Interpretation Service (RDIS) of the nation-wide Research and Development Exchange (RDx), funded by the National Institute of Education. RDIS staff were primarily responsible for the design and overall management of the survey. Each of the Regional Exchanges assisted with the collection of data from state staff in their respective regions and also served as members of the RDx Task Force on Validation. Staff from RDIS, located at CEMREL, Inc., from Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL), and from Research for Better Schools (RBS) shared in the preparation of the survey report.

Preliminary data collection generally occurred in the period of February-August 1980. Initial summaries of the data were examined at a

task force meeting in October 1980. Follow-up data collection and verification of data, to assure a common data base across Rx regions, occurred in January-February 1981. The first draft of the report was reviewed for completeness, clarity, and utility by a nationally representative panel of state staff in July 1981. The report was revised to accommodate the majority of the panel's suggestions.

The survey results are summarized in Chart 1, an Overview of Current State Validation Practices, which is broken into two parts. Part 1 identifies the validation process used by each state and state implementation procedures and valiation efforts to date. Part 2 identifies state organizational arrangements and support for dissemination of validated programs. To facilitate a better understanding of these charts, brief descriptions of the Identification, Validation, Dissemination (IVD) process, the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) process, and the Sharing Business Success process follow the chart.

Extent of State Participation in Validation Activities

Of the fifty states surveyed, the great majority (N=45) have some form of established procedure for validating promising educational practices. Alabama, Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Nevada reported that they do not have a procedure.

General Processes Employed by States

Approximately two-thirds (N=29) of the states that have validation programs (N=45) employ either the IVD procedure (N=23)

or some modification of the IVD procedure (N=6). Typical modifications of IVD involve the use of in-state site reviewers to reduce costs and/or the use of state review panels in conjunction with the site visits. Roughly a third of the states (N=16) reported that they use their own state-developed validation processes. The state-developed processes differ from IVD with respect to the specific criteria and operational procedures used to verify the effectiveness and transportability of the promising practices. Two of the states with their own processes (New Hampshire and Pennsylvania) viewed them as modifications of the JDRP process.

State Training, Implementation Procedures, Schedules, and Validation Efforts

Training for validation team members is a fundamental implementation concern. Eighteen states reported that IVD sponsored training sessions constitute the primary source of training for their validation team members. Twenty-five states conduct their own training sessions. The training varies from one- or two-hour briefing sessions on a state's validation criteria to one- or two-day workshops on validation criteria, simulations, procedures, and skills. Two states, Colorado and Maryland, use both IVD and state-developed training.

In the great majority of cases (N=39) the actual implementation of the state validation process involves some form of prescreening to

determine if a project is ready for validation. This prescreening activity is an essential, but not widely publicized, aspect of state validation practices. Significant variations exist in the number, composition, and title of the state screening committees (teams, panels, advisory councils, review committees, etc.). Their primary aim, however, is to avoid the expense and embarrassment that occur when site visits are made to districts not fully prepared for validation. Following prescreening, most states (N=43) conduct site visits to verify, first-hand, projects' status on the state's validation criteria. Again, significant variation occurs in the length of the site visits (one to three days), the number of team members (one to five), and the composition of the teams (state/local mix and in/out-of-state mix). Half of the states that conduct site visits use only in-state members on their site visit validation teams (N=20) primarily for economic reasons. Among the states that do use out-of-state validation team members, there is a growing trend to use a reduced number of out-of-state staff, again for economic reasons. In the majority of the above cases the site-team report/recommendation to "validate" or "not validate" a project constitutes the state's bottom-line procedure for validating exemplary programs--that is, the validation team <u>is</u> the decision-making body.

In three states, however--California, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania--the decision-making procedure that is used to validate exemplary

programs consists of a majority approval by a panel of reviewers. As might be expected, there are variations among these states in panel numbers and composition, in state validation criteria, and in the use of site-visit data to elucidate further the panel's decisions. In California and Pennsylvania site visits are conducted only if deemed necessary to provide the panel with additional data. In Kentucky they are built into the state process. State schedules for program validation also vary. Approximately 24 states have set schedules where applications for validation are reviewed and state validation procedures are initiated only at a specified time each year. Twenty states report that they have open schedules and either validate projects on a continuous year-round basis or in groups at irregular intervals at state staff convenience and/or on demand.

It also bears noting that only a quarter of the states (N=12) offer systematic, proactive assistance to projects with evaluation tasks related to the validation requirements. Most states inform projects that fail validation of their weaknesses vis a vis the state validation criteria and provide informal evaluation assistance or guidance on request.

Finally, there appears to be a trend toward requiring validated projects to be revalidated after a set period of time. Seven

states currently have revalidation procedures in operation and another ten states are considering the initiation of program revalidation procedures.

The above summary provides an overview of extant state implementation procedures for validating exemplary programs. The actual number of programs reviewed and validated is described next.

Roughly three-fourths of the states (N=32) involved in validating exemplary programs review between 1 and 10 projects per year. Only twelve states review 11 or more projects per year. Of these approximately three-fourths of the states (N=29) validate between 1 and 5 programs per year. Another nine states validate from 6-10 projects per year and six states validate 11 or more per year. Based on conservative mid-range estimates, therefore, between 200 and 250 state exemplary projects are validated annually in the United States.

State Organizational Arrangements and Support for the Dissemination of Validated Programs

Further examination of the Overview Chart reveals that in the great majority of the states (N=37), state IV-C staff have primary responsibility for the implementation of the state's validation program. In seven states the responsibility for implementing the validation process rests with dissemination unit staff, program development staff, or research and development staff. In the majority of the states, one to three staff are required to manage the state's

validation effort. In most cases these staff have other responsibilities and work on validation related tasks only on a part-time basis. A handful of states, however, involve up to as many as twenty-five of their staff in the validation effort, strictly on an as-needed basis for brief periods of time.

Overall, there appears to be a fairly consistent policy among the states to support financially the dissemination and adoption of exemplary projects once they are validated. Twenty-seven states, over half of the states involved in validation, reported that they provided support to both the developer/demonstrators (D/Ds) and the adopter/adapters (A/As) of validated programs. Title IV-C monies constitute the primary source of support for D/Ds and A/As. D/Ds are usually provided the greater amount of support to assist with the reproduction of materials, the conduct of dissemination activities, and the partial support of staff salaries for dissemination activities. A/A grants most commonly range between $5,000 and $10,000 and are intended to support staff development and other start-up costs, such as related materials costs.

The Overview Chart also reveals that most states require that D/Ds operate at least one year as a demonstration site (N=40) and provide materials and general assistance to authorized A/As (N=43). Only a few states (N=9), however, require that D/Ds actively monitor or evaluate, in some way, implementation of exemplary programs by A/As.

The Overview Chart illustrates that most states utilize state catalogs, workshops, conferences, and various kinds of print media to disseminate information about validated programs.

State Collaborative Activities

Close to three-fourths of the states reportedly are involved in some form of cooperative activities with other nearby states. The cooperative activities, however, center primarily on implementation of the validation procedure (e.g., use of other states' validators) and information sharing activities (exchange of state catalogs, joint participation in conferences). Few, if any, states cooperate by the actual sharing of validated programs. There has been discussion of the cross-state use of validated programs. At present political barriers and lack of incentives have nullified prospective activity in that direction.

The above description completes the general overview of state validation practices current as of June 1981, as obtained from the RDx survey study. In large part the great majority of states reported that they were "bullish" on the process of validating exemplary programs. The states also shared a number of concerns and recommendations.

The concerns and recommendations voiced regarding both IVD and JDRP are indicative of the states' strong interest in the validation process and should be viewed accordingly.

Concerns

The primary concerns centered on three key issues: (1) the tension extant between the extreme rigor of the JDRP process and the variability implicit in states' implementation of the "softer" IVD process, resulting in inconsistent federal and state validation policies and concomitant duplication of LEA validation efforts; (2) the lack of sufficient funding or limitations on funding which inhibit additional development work by D/Ds, adequate monitoring and follow-up of D/D dissemination and A/A implementation activities, and more widespread intrastate dissemination of validated projects; and (3) the general observation that the dissemination/diffusion of validated IV-C programs is an apparent add-on in the minds of federal planners.

Recommendations

A number of recommendations or suggestions were made in four general areas.

Coordination and communication were the foci of several recommendations:

- There should be more and better communication with federal officials in the regional offices.
- Funding should be made available to encourage contiguous states to work together for validating programs.
- The encouragement of use of one set of criteria by all states would permit sufficient reliability to allow easier adoption across state lines.

- IVD criteria should be accepted by all ESEA categorical programs.
- State/regional/national catalogs of programs should include data about use of projects by adopters.

Several suggestions concerned JDRP and the scope of JDRP programs:

- JDRP should look at programs in career education, nutrition education, child development, etc.
- JDRP should include programs developed in non-public schools.
- JDRP should mandate site visits.
- JDRP should encourage programs to submit other than just those that are student achievement-oriented.
- JDRP should examine innovations of a program developed by adopters.
- JDRP and IVD should be more closely married.

Several recommendations concerned funding:

- D/Ds should receive more support for ongoing development activities.
- Funds should be dedicated to encouraging regional activities.
- The five-year funding limit should be re-examined.
- IV-C funding should be increased as more LEAs become involved.

A number of recommendations centered on diffusion efforts:

- Catalogs should be updated and non-functioning programs eliminated. NDN files should also be updated.
- Adopters should be followed up in a systematic way.
- Re-training should be provided for adopters periodically.

As evidenced by the above summary, state interest in and concerns about extant procedures for validating exemplary programs is quite vital. The present descriptive study was just a first step, serving to identify and focus that interest. A logical next step would consist of federal and state follow-up regarding the concerns and recommendations cited in this report. In addition, it is recommended that funding be strongly considered for descriptive and impact studies of state dissemination efforts. The present study was limited to describing extant state validation procedures, issues, and concerns. There is a pressing need, especially in this period of declining resources, for further information about short- and long-term D/D and A/A behaviors, to identify ways to improve the dissemination and use of validated exemplary programs.

Chart 1. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STATE VALIDATION PRACTICES

Part 1

C = Combination
V = Variable
O = Optional
SF = State Facilitator

State	VALIDATION PROCESS USED: STATE PROCESS: IVD	Modified IVD	State Dev.	Modified JDRP	STATE IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE AND VALIDATION EFFORTS TO DATE: PRIMARY SOURCE OF TRAINING: IVD	State	VALIDATION PROCEDURE: Prescreen Applicants	On Site Visit	On Out of State	One Panel	Avg. # PROJECTS REVIEWED/YEAR: 1-10	11-more	Avg. # PROJECTS VALIDATED/YEAR: 1-5	6-10	11-more	VALIDATION SCHEDULE: Set Dates Once a Year	Open Dates	STATE SUPPORT OF NONMEDIATED PROGRAMS: Informal/ On Request	Systematic	RETESTING RE-VALIDATION: Yes	No	Considering
AK			•			•		•		•	•			•					•		•	
AR	•				•		•	•	•		•		•				•	•			•	
AZ			•			•	•	•		•						•					•	
CA			•			•		•		•		•		•		•			•		•	
CO	•				•	•	•		•		•		•			•						•
CT			•			•	•	•		•		•			•	•			•			•
DE	•				•		•	•	•		•		•			•		•			•	
FL	•					•	•	•	C	•	•			•		•		•			•	
GA	•				•		•	•	•		•		•				•	•		•		
IA	•				•		•	•	•		•		•				•	•			•	
ID		•				•	•	•	•	•	•		•			•		•			•	

	VALIDATION PROCESS USED				STATE IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE AND VALIDATION EFFORTS TO DATE																			
	STATE PROCESS				PRIMARY SOURCE OF TRAINING		VALIDATION PROCEDURE				Avg. # PROJECTS REVIEWED/YEAR		Avg. # PROJECTS VALIDATED/YEAR			VALIDATION SCHEDULE		STATE SUPPORT OF VALIDATED PROGRAMS		REQUIRE RE-VALIDATION		
State	FHB	Modified FHB	State Dev.	Modified State	FHB	State	Prescreen Applicants	Use Site Visit	Use Out of State	Use Panel	1-10	11-more	1-5	6-10	11-more	Set Dates Once a Year	Open Dates	Informal/ On Request	Systematic	Yes	No	Considering
IL	•				•		•	•	•			•		•		•			•		•			
IN	•				•		•	•			•		•				•				•			
KS	•			•	•		•	•	•		•		•			•		•				•		
KY			•			•	•	•		•		•			•		•	•		•				
MA		•				•	•	•				•		•		•			•		•			
MD			•		•	•	•	•			•		•				•	•		•				
ME		•			•		•	•			•		•				•		•			•		
MI			•			•	•	•				•			•		•				•			
MN	•				•		•	•	•	•	•		•			•					•			
MO	•				•		•	•	•		•		•				•	•			•			
MT		•				•	•	•	•	•	•		•				•	•			•			

Chart 1. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STATE VALIDATION PRACTICES

Part 1 (continued)

C = Combination
V = Variable
O = Optional
SF = State Facilitator

	VALIDATION PROCESS USED				STATE IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE AND VALIDATION EFFORTS TO DATE																			
	STATE PROCESS				PRIMARY SOURCE OF TRAINING		VALIDATION PROCEDURE					Avg. # PROJECTS REVIEWED/YEAR		Avg. # PROJECTS VALIDATED/YEAR			VALIDATION SCHEDULE		STATE SUPPORT OF INVALIDATED PROGRAMS		REQUIRE RE-VALIDATION		
State	FED	Modified FED	State Rev.	Modified JOHP	FED	State	Prescreen Applicants	Use Site Visit	Use Out of State	Use Panel		1-10	11-more	1-5	6-10	11-more	Set Dates Once a Year	Open Dates	Informal/ On Request	Systematic	Yes	No	Considering
NB	●				●		●	●	●			●		●			●		●			●		
NC	●					●	●	●	C	●		●		●			●		●			●		
ND	●					●	●	●	●			●		●				●	●					●
NH				●		●	●	●		●		●			●			●		●				●
NJ	●					●	●	●	●				●		●		●			●				●
NM			●			●	●	●				●			●		●		●					●
NY			●			●	●	●	●				●			●		●		●			●	
OH			●			●	●	●					●	●			●						●	
OK	●				●		●	●				●		●			●		●		●			
OR			●			●		●		●		●		●			●						●	
PA			●	●		●				●			●			●	●		●				●	

	VALIDATION PROCESS USED				STATE IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE AND VALIDATION EFFORTS TO DATE																			
	STATE PROCESS				PRIMARY SOURCE OF TRAINING		VALIDATION PROCEDURE				Avg. # PROJECTS REVIEWED/YEAR		Avg. # PROJECTS VALIDATED/YEAR			VALIDATION SCHEDULE		STATE SUPPORT OF NONVALIDATED PROGRAMS		REQUIRE RE-VALIDATION		
State	FHD	Modified FHD	State Dev.	Modified JOBP	FHD	State	Prescreen Applicants	Use Site Visit	Use Out of State	Use Panel	1-10	11-more	1-5	6-10	11-more	Set Dates Once a Year	Upon Dates	Informal/ On Request	Systematic	Yes	No	Considering
RI	●				●		●	●			●		●			●			●		●	
SC	●					●		●	C	●	●		●				●	●			●	
SD	●				●		●	●	●		●		●			●		●			●	
TN		●				●		●		●	●		●				●	●			●	
TX			●			●	●	●				●			●	●		●		●		
UT	●	●			●		●	●	●		●		●				●	●	●	●		
VA	●				●		●	●	●	●		●	●				●	●			●	
VT			●			●	●	●	●		●		●				●		●			●
WA			●			●	●	●		●	●			●			●					●
WI	●				●		●	●			●		●			●		●			●	
WV			●			●	●	●		●	●		●			●		●			●	
WY	●				●		●	●	●		●		●				●	●			●	

C = Combination
V = Variable
O = Optional
SF = State Facilitator

Chart 1. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STATE VALIDATION PRACTICES

Part 2

	STATE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND SUPPORT FOR DISSEMINATION OF VALIDATED PROGRAMS											
	STATE STAFF			AMOUNT OF STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT		D/D RESPONSIBILITIES			DISSEMINATION PROCESSES		
State	IV-C	Other	#	For D/D	For A/A	Operate at Least 1 Year as Demo. Site (Awareness Sessions, etc.)	Provide Materials to and Assist A/As	Monitor/Evaluate A/As	State Catalog	Printed Media	Fairs Workshops Conferences
AK			1	50-100K			•		•	•	•
AR	•		1	V	V	•	•		•	•	•
AZ		•		--	--		•		•		•
CA	•		1 FT, 8 PT	560K	10K	•	•	•	•	•	•
CO	•		1	10-20K	5K	•	•	•		•	
CT	•	•	3	10K	5K	•	•			•	•
DE		•	1	5-6K	5-6K	•	•		•		•
FL	•		1	V	5K	•	•	•	•	•	•
GA	•		5			•	•			•	•
IA	•		1	V	5K	•	•			•	•
ID	•		5		$800-7.5K	•	•	•		•	

STATE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND SUPPORT FOR DISSEMINATION OF VALIDATED PROGRAMS												
	STATE STAFF			AMOUNT OF STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT		D/D RESPONSIBILITIES			DISSEMINATION PROCESSES		
State	IV-C	Other	#	For D/D	For A/A	Operate at Least 1 Year as Demo. Site (Awareness Sessions, etc.)	Provide Materials to and Assist A/As	Monitor/Evaluate A/As	State Catalog	Printed Media	Fairs Workshops Conferences
IL	•		1FT,25PT	30-50K	1.5 FTE	•	•		•	•	•
IN	•		6	V	5K	•	•		•	•	•
KS	•		1		3K	•	•		•	•	•
KY		•	4			•	•		•	•	
MA	•	•	6+	V	3K	•	•		•		
MD	•	•	12PT	--	--	•	•		•	•	
ME	•	•	2	V	7K	•	•	•	•	•	•
MI	•		1FT,20PT	60-70K	5K	•	•		•	•	•
MN	•		3	6K	10K	•	•		•	•	•
MO	•		3		5K	•	•		•	•	•
MT	•		3				•			•	

C = Combination
V = Variable
O = Optional
SF = State Facilitator

Chart 1. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STATE VALIDATION PRACTICES

Part 2 (continued)

	STATE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND SUPPORT FOR DISSEMINATION OF VALIDATED PROGRAMS											
	STATE STAFF			AMOUNT OF STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT		D/D RESPONSIBILITIES			DISSEMINATION PROCESSES		
State	IV-C	Other	#	For D/D	For A/A	Operate at Least 1 Year as Demo. Site (Awareness Sessions, etc.)	Provide Materials to and Assist A/As	Monitor/Evaluate A/As	State Catalog	Printed Media	Fairs Workshops Conferences
NB	●		6	10-60K	2.5K	●	●	O		●	
NC	●		1			●	●			●	●
ND	●		1	3-15K	3-15K	●	●		●	●	●
NH	●	●	1	10-25K	3-6K	●	●	●	●	●	●
NJ		●	2	30K	7-8K	●	●		●	●	●
NM	●		2	10K	--	●	●		●	●	●
NY	●	●	6	45-60K	7.5K	●	●		●	●	●
OH	●		2		V	D/D Decides			●	●	●
OK	●		--	V	V	●	●		●	●	
OR	●		2	25-100K	5K		●	●	●	●	●
PA	●		2		5-6K	●	●		●	●	●

STATE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND SUPPORT FOR DISSEMINATION OF VALIDATED PROGRAMS

State	STATE STAFF IV-C	STATE STAFF Other	STATE STAFF #	AMOUNT OF STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT For D/D	AMOUNT OF STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT For A/A	D/D RESPONSIBILITIES Operate at Least 1 Year as Demo. Site (Awareness Sessions, etc.)	D/D RESPONSIBILITIES Provide Materials to and Assist A/As	D/D RESPONSIBILITIES Monitor/Evaluate A/As	DISSEMINATION PROCESSES State Catalog	DISSEMINATION PROCESSES Printed Media	DISSEMINATION PROCESSES Fairs Workshops Conferences
RI	•	•	2	V	6-10K	•	•			•	
SC	•		1			•	•		•	•	
SD	•		1	700 (SF)	5-7.5K (IV-C)	•	•	•	•	•	
TN		•	4			•				•	•
TX		•	5	--	1.5.million a year	•	•		•	•	•
UT	•	•	--	V	V	•	•				•
VA	•		3	25K	10K	•	•	•	•	•	
VT	•	•	3	--	5-6K	•	•		•	•	•
WA		•	1	10-25K	IV-C, 500K state, 1.2 million		•			•	•
WI	•		1	15K	3-25K	•	•			•	•
WV	•		3	25K	5K	•	•			•	•
WY	•		1	6K		•	•			•	•

The RDx Collaborative Effort on the Validation of Educational Programs and Practices includes four products:

Survey of State Procedures for the Validation of Educational Programs, by Linda Reed, Ed Patrick, and David Holdzkom. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., for the R&D Exchange, 1981.

Survey of State Procedures for the Validation of Educational Programs. Executive Summary, by Linda Reed, Ed Patrick, and David Holdzkom. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., for the R&D Exchange, 1981.

The Search for Quality Control in Dissemination of Educational Products and Practices: A Look at the Literature and Major Issues, by Linda Reed. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., R&D Interpretation Service, 1981.

Validation of Educational Programs, Practices and Products: An Annotated Bibliography, prepared by Karen Temmen, Mary Ann Isaacs, and Sandra Ruder. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., for the R&D Exchange, 1981.